of doing that will have the biggest audience, and, therefore, will be passing the localism test with flying colors.

There are enough signals out there so we can have a news station, and we can have a music station, and we can have a talk station. We don't have to have all stations be required to do a certain amount of news.

If, instead, the FCC determines that we must broadcast things like city council meetings -- and I happen to be a city councilor -- I don't think anybody would listen, and I don't think that's good localism. I would equate it to the old question, if a tree falls in the woods and no one hears it, does it make any noise.

Keeping the business survival motive in mind, we broadcasters have to be highly motivated to find people who want to hear us. With the freedom for each station to choose its own course, based on its own research of what the public wants, the public interest, convenience and necessity from the Communications Act of 1936 will be served.

What I want to do is determine the public needs will probably be entirely different from my competitors. I'm constantly out in the community, and over the past 32 years I've served as chairman of chambers, I've been a founding president of the United

Way. I've served on many boards, Boys and Girls Clubs. I've done it all. I've also received the Broadcaster of the Year Award from the Maine Association of Broadcasters.

But is that truly what localism is all about? I think -- I can give you all kinds of examples of what my operation does. We have a swap shop where people can call in and buy, trade, and sell. We estimate we put a million dollars back in the economy through the swap shop. We have a French show serving our Franco-American community. We have a community calendar every hour. We have broadcast of high school sports. I have Christian programs everyday. We do all kinds of things to serve the community. But if I have no audience, am I really passing the localism test?

Localism is won and lost in the marketplace. It shouldn't matter where the announcer is, where the studio is, or even who owns it, as long as that station is doing its job of giving the people what they want.

(Audience applause.)

Our incredibly competitive environment should determine the best localism, and not the FCC. I'd like to personally invite each of you to come to my studio in Lewiston-Auburn, spend a few days with me, talk to the businesses who are trying to survive with the

advertising. Talk to the other people, and you'll see what it's like living in the trenches as a broadcaster, owner/operator for 32 years.

Thank you very much.

MR. ENSSLIN: Mr. Haskell.

MR. HASKELL: Thank you, Commissioners, and welcome to Maine. I'm a former radio broadcaster, who 20 years ago began my second career in higher education, and now find my myself the Academic Dean of the New England School of Communications, located in Bangor, Maine, offering Associate and Bachelor of Science degrees in Communications. We educate and train close to 400 students in many communication-related areas, but have always taught television and radio broadcasting, both performance and production.

For over 25 years we have been placing our graduates in radio and TV stations across this state, from Kittery to Fort Kent, as they say, and into the other New England states, especially New Hampshire and Vermont. We now have graduates working in communication occupations all across the United States.

The majority of our radio and TV instructors are men and women who are working or have worked in broadcasting, and that is what they teach. This has been the strength of our program over the years,

dedicated instructors who bring a wealth of knowledge and practical experience to the classroom, as well as the workplace reality and a demonstrable work ethic needed to succeed in the high paced communications industry.

I could go on longer about the school and the excellent faculty, but with limited time I need to share my thoughts regarding localism with you.

From day one, our students are told, shown, and then get to experience the very nature of broadcasting, and begin to understand the underlying truth that we are a service industry, not unlike the local hospital or educational institutions or the law enforcement and fire fighting agencies in our town. They also learn that our mission as broadcasters, simply stated, is to provide information, entertainment, and companionship to our listeners and viewers. They learn we are obligated to serve our community in many, many ways, often free of charge.

Many of my broadcast instructors were in the business when the industry was regulated, and they never lose sight of the truism that the airwaves belong to the public, and, therefore, it follows we must serve in the public interest. Those two phrases are taught and demonstrated time and time again in our broadcasting

classes.

Our students learn about the past, look expectantly to the future which they hope to be part of, and even before graduation as interns, they learn about the present while involved in radio and TV stations across the state and in their home towns. They witness firsthand the daily efforts of programmers, producers, news people, public service directors, account executives, and promotional people, and learn just how interaction with the local community is essential to the success of a radio or TV station in Maine. Our teachings of localism, if you will, are reinforced daily as they become more and more aware of this aspect of broadcasting.

As an educator seeking placement for my graduates and one who has worked in the era of stand-alone or small group-owned stations, I was concerned when the large corporations made the scene and began to buy up all the mom and pop radio stations in town. I saw automation replacing live people and loss of jobs for my graduates. I witnessed the decrease in local news coverage and public affairs programming. I grieved the loss of the independent stations and their role as employers and creative counter-programming competitors who brought variety and innovation to their product.

THE REPORTING GROUP

(Audience applause.)

Working at a school that provides many, many trained employees to broadcasters in Maine, however, makes me a constant observer of the media. And I have observed this: Localism is returning and returning quickly.

Ironically, it's the new buzz word of today's broadcasters. It went away for a little while, but then the marketplace, even more than public outcry, demonstrated to the huge corporate owners that if you are not local in your own community, you will not succeed.

In response to lower ratings garnered by radio stations with few, if any, live personalities, the calls to my school now ask for trained announcers for afternoon drive, middays, and even the night shifts. Now you hear the slogan, live and local on a regular basis.

As terrestrial radio and TV stations compete with satellite and cable delivered programming, they know the best way to keep listeners and viewers, and subsequently advertisers, is to stay local and to provide what the local community asks for in the way of news, weather, sports, features, public affairs, and daily programming.

The marketplace has driven the corporate bottom-liners to the realization that the bottom line is only as good as their stations' ability to attract and keep what we fondly refer to as our loyal listener or viewer.

Today you will hear many examples of excellent local programming with ongoing initiatives aimed at increasing community service. I, for one, am convinced that the pendulum has begun to swing back and that the broadcasting industry knows it must respond to its public who will, either quietly or noisily, let them know if they are not being served.

Fear not, for whether you call it localism or serving in the public interest, it cannot and will not go away. Broadcasters rely on the public to succeed, and the public relies on its broadcasters to keep them entertained, to be there with timely, often critical information, and to be that friendly presence 24/7 that makes life just a little better.

Thank you.

(Audience applause.)

MR. ENSSLIN: Thank you, Mr. Haskell.

Ms. Heintz.

MS. HEINTZ: Good afternoon, Commissioners, and welcome to Maine.

I live just minutes from here in Falmouth, and I teach in the Communications and Media Studies Department at the University of Southern Maine. I also conducted research for advocacy groups, and today I'm here representing Children Now, who would like to encourage you to consider the impact of your rule making on the children in the television audience.

While most U.S. families have access to cable or satellite television and the outstanding offerings for children on channels like Nickelodeon and Disney, still nearly one in five U.S. children rely solely on broadcast television for their viewing, and both the FCC and the U.S. Congress have repeatedly affirmed that children are a unique audience who must be considered when assessing broadcasters public interest obligations.

Unfortunately, children aren't often the focus of discussions about the effects of media ownership, however; but Children Now's research has shown that children do, in fact, suffer negative consequences as a result of media consolidation, and specifically the formation of dualopolies.

The National Association of Broadcasters argues that dualopoly ownership is necessary to preserve and enhance television broadcasters' ability to serve their

viewers and communities in markets of all sizes. Previous research by Children Now disputes this, and evidence I'll present today also refutes this claim.

In 2003 Children Now studied the impact of dualopoly ownership on the availability of children's programs in the L.A. market -- Los Angeles market, and discovered that over a five-year period stations in dualopoly owned situations reduced their children program offering significantly more than stations that were not part of dualopolies.

While the current renewed interest in ownership rules, Children Now conducted another larger study to see if the pattern discovered in Los Angeles is evident in markets in other regions of other sizes. This summer Children Now will be releasing a report detailing case studies of eight media markets around the U.S., but this afternoon I'll be sharing some preliminary findings from our study that are specific to Portland/Auburn Maine.

We selected one full week of programming from March of 1998, before any stations in the market had multiple ownership situations, and March of 2006; and used TV guides and stations' FCC 398 forms to identify all the children's programs aired on the commercial broadcast stations in eight sample marks, including Portland/Auburn Maine.

We compared the number of programs and program hours across the two time periods and accessed the rates of change from time one to time two. Portland/Auburn currently has six commercial broadcast stations, two of which are owned by the same parent company. These two stations make up a dualopoly. The other stations are singly owned.

It's important to note that Portland/Auburn saw a huge decrease in commercial broadcast of children's programming from 1998 to 2006. Children today have access to approximately half the number of programs and program hours that were available to them just eight years ago.

Three important findings emerged from the examination of the Portland/Auburn market. First, in Portland/Auburn, between 1996 -- or 1998 and 2006, there were significant differences in the changes made in the children's program offerings by dualopoly and non-dualopoly stations. Dualopolies decreased the hours and number of children's programs by nearly 80 percent, while non-dualopoly stations increased their program availability and diversity.

Second, dualopoly stations in Portland/Auburn are currently offering significantly fewer educational programs than are non-dualopoly stations. All the

stations in this market program slightly more than the minimum required three hours per week of educational/ informational programs for children, but stations that are part of dualopoly -- dualopolies air fewer unique shows during that time allotment.

Stations that are not part of dualopolies air nearly seven EI shows per week, while the dualopoly stations air between two and three programs and repeat them during the course of the week. This repetition indicates a lack of program diversity from which children can choose.

Third, children's local programming in Portland is virtually nonexistence. When we conducted the study in 2006, none of the children's programs from 1998 or 2006 were locally produced. There is one program locally produced today, Kick Start Maine, for middle schoolers, but that's out of 54 programs, less than 2 percent of the children's programming aired in this market.

Children benefit from experiencing media that originates from their local community because it shows them that they and their community are important and valuable. Depending on the program's content, it can teach children about local civic affairs and help them become more engaged in their community life.

Children in southern Maine are not reaping the

benefits that locally produced shows could provide. We feel these findings clearly indicate that concentration of ownership does not benefit the child audience, and strongly urge you to consider children in your decision making regarding ownership rules.

(Audience applause.)

MR. ENSSLIN: Thank you, Ms. Heintz.

Mr. Leary.

MR. LEARY: Thank you.

As a journalist my entire life, I was somewhat surprised when I was called and asked if I would be interested in testifying at this localism hearing.

When I've written about the changing nature of broadcasting in Maine, indeed I've been part of those changes. To get straight to the issue posed by these hearings, what can the Commission do to ensure that broadcasters operate in the public interest as is required by the license they get for use of the limited amount of broadcast spectrum that is available.

First and foremost, the Commission must recognize the dramatic and sweeping changes that have occurred in the media, of which broadcasting is only a part. When I was growing up, and it's not all that long ago, despite what my kids would tell you, there were not the hundreds of channels available that there are now on cable or

satellite or over the year multicasting that's available with digital TV and digital radio stations.

When the Commission seeks to access how broadcasters are operating in the public interest in a state like Maine, they need to look at the whole area served, not just the city of license. News is expensive. I've been in news management. I prefer to be a reporter. As the Commission has allowed more and more broadcast stations, it seems to me they have not looked at the economics of operating in the public interest in rural, poor areas like Maine, compared to wealthy urban areas.

Advertisers, as Dick was saying, pay for the size of the audience they reach. That is fundamental of commercial broadcasting. It takes far fewer ads to pay the bills in Boston than it does in Bangor.

Based on my observation, there are those that argue ownership of stations needs to be local in order to meet the public interest. I believe they're wrong. What is crucial is local management that knows the community their station serves and how to meet the needs of those communities.

(Audience applause.)

I reject the notion from some that all the big group station owners are somehow related to Darth Vader

and only care for the bottom line of their corporate profits. I also reject those broadcasters that say they're doing everything they possibly can to meet their public interest obligations. As in politics, which I write about with some frequency, the truth here is somewhere in between.

Back to economics for a moment. Serving the public interest does not mean just news or talk shows and public affairs programs. It means reaching out to the community to help charities raise money and to help educate the public on a wide array of issues.

Like other consumers, I can now watch the hearings of Congress or listen to the hearings of the state legislature as they happen. But in all of this flood of information sources, the need to explain, the need to put in context, the need to tell the rest of the story, and I hope Paul Harvey will forgive me for stealing his line, is what journalists do.

I remember well explaining to one bank executive visiting the State asking me what had just happened to a bill on the floor of the House. He was thoroughly confused at the arcane parliamentary language, thinking his bill had just passed, when it had just been defeated. There are fewer of us to provide that explanation as the economics of providing news and

information programming has hit station owners regardless of size.

When I first started as a state house reporter, there were six full-time radio reporters covering state government. Two television stations had crews nearly everyday of the week at the state house. There were also bureaus representing a half dozen newspapers and two wire services. Today I'm the only full-time radio reporter, even though I also write newspaper stories. There are no TV stations at the state house on a regular basis, there's only one wire service left, and only three papers now have reporters assigned there on a full-time basis.

State government is important in any state, but in some states like Maine, central services important to the public are more centralized than they are in many other parts of the country.

For example, in most states, human services programs, like food stamps and child welfare programs, are run at the county level. Here in Maine they're centralized. They're provided by State workers. As president of the Maine Freedom of Information Coalition, which is a broad-based group that ranges from environmental advocates to hunters and fishermen, as well as media groups, I saw firsthand the impact of a

series of public service messages aired by many members of the Maine Association of Broadcasters educating the public about their right to public documents and to attend meetings of government agencies.

Assessing the public interest obligations of broadcasters should not be a one-size-fits-all approach. The Commission needs to develop a dynamic process to assess each local area and not establish nonsensical rules that find a station has operated in the public interest, or not, because it aired some fixed number of public service announcements or does a daily newscast.

Let me close with this. From what I've read, these localism hearings have focused on radio and TV station licensees, but the Commission also regulates cable TV systems and satellite providers. What assessment is being made of those companies meeting their public interest obligations? They're also using the public airwaves.

Thank you.

(Audience applause.)

MR. ENSSLIN: Thank you, Mr. Leary.

Mr. von Lichtenberg.

MR. von LICHTENBERG: Buenas Tardes. Me llamo Alejandro Amadeus del Monte Lucero Mil Santos, y soy el

Gerente Geral de WUNI-TV 27, en Boston.

For those of you who don't understand Spanish, I'm Alexander von Lichtenberg. I'm the general manager of WUNI-TV 27, the Univision Television Network affiliate in Boston, Massachusetts. WUNI is owned and operated by Entravision Communications Corporation.

First I'd like to thank the FCC for inviting me to speak today. Second, I want to tell you all how much I enjoy coming to Maine. While I'm here today on a professional basis, I'll be back in the beginning of August on Crescent Beach, with my wife and daughter, enjoying this lovely state.

WUNI holds a unique position within the television broadcast geography here in New England. For ten years we were the only Spanish language full-powered television station in this region broadcasting the Spanish language to the very rapidly growing Spanish language population.

While there are now two other full-powered TV stations broadcasting in Spanish in the Boston market, we remain unique because we're the only one that produces a live -- nightly live local news program, Noticiero Univision Nueva Inglaterra, Univision News New England.

Noticiero Univision Nueva Inglaterra provides a

valuable service to Boston's rapidly growing Hispanic population. Our news team covers the daily local, regional, and sometimes national events that impact our viewers' lives in the language they prefer.

We offer fair and balanced coverage similar to the English language stations in the market, but we also provide an important sound board for the Hispanic point of view on events that involve individuals or organizations within the local Hispanic community.

In such instances, we speak directly to the news makers, be they individuals, their families, governmental organizations, businesses or nonprofits who are working to serve our viewers. Within our news we produce weekly features, Enfocando En Sus Financas, Focus On Your Finances; Los Latinos Y Su Salud, Latinos and Their Health; Pachanga Latina, Latin Party. These provide timely financial, health and, yes, entertainment-related information for our viewers.

Viewers tuning into our station this year have received extensive coverage and information on the immigration reform debate, both from local proponents and opponents. WUNI has also served as a source of information to our viewers on the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, landmark universal healthcare legislation. For many of our viewers, our nearly daily

coverage of these stories serves as their primary source of information on these two important elements.

This spring, to better serve our local community, we launched Despierta Boston, Wake Up Boston. These are three-minute cutins over the Univision Network programming, morning show, to provide our viewers with the latest news, weather, and traffic information reports Mondays through Fridays.

Beyond our news programming, WUNI airs tens of thousands of public service announcements each year, often produced by the station. These PSA's keep the Boston Hispanic community informed about programs, services, and events hosted by local, municipal, and nonprofit organizations.

We're usually the first call that gets made when an organization that deals in the Hispanic community wants to get news out about a service or a fundraising opportunity within the community; and we have a history of helping out.

Our community outreach efforts are extensive. I'm going to -- I can go into detail on them, but time is of the essence here.

I will tell you, though, that WUNI values the relationship it has in the community, and it's made possible by providing the local information and

assistance that our viewers expect from their local broadcast station. We work hard to cultivate a local presence and to serve the needs of the community. The programming and services we provide give us a unique and a valuable position within the Boston broadcast landscape.

WUNI is particularly fortunate to have the support of our owner, Entravision Communications Corporation, which places great importance on local programming and community outreach to produce our local news, public affairs programming, sponsor outreach efforts, and to maintain our connection to the local Hispanic community. We look forward to continuing to do so in the future.

Once again, thank you. Gracias.

MR. ENSSLIN: Thank you, Mr. von Lichtenberg.

Ms. Meyer.

MS. MEYER: Good afternoon, Commissioners.

The Sun Media Group is a conglomeration of seven weeklies and one daily newspaper. The weeklies are a pretty recent acquisition, but the Sun Journal has been owned and operated by the same family for better than a century, which, in journalism, is a real luxury.

It also means that we can really focus on what our readers want to see in our paper, which is not national

and international news. It's micro local news. It's American Legion ball scores. It's a hole in one at the last golf tournament. It's the school honor rolls. If your social calendar is limited to a baked bean supper on a Saturday night, we can tell you where to go, what time it starts, and how much it's going to cost you. That's our specialty. It's really local news because we are locally owned.

I think one of the most important things we provide to our readers is the fundamental birth records, death records, transfers of property deeds, divorces, graduations, criminal records, basically the public recording of who we are and who lives in our communities; and it's really important for genealogists to have that information to be able to go back and track who we are, otherwise frequently this information is lost.

That doesn't mean that we don't do local investigative pieces. We certainly do. But they have to be abundantly important to our readers; and I'll give you a for instance. Last year when there was the shooting at the Pennsylvania school when the children were killed by the gunman who walked into the building, of course the whole nation rippled with how safe is my child. And our readers were really concerned about

that, so we decided to test, see how safe the children in our community really are.

And we sent reporters to 35 schools in our readership area, asked them to walk in the front door, not introduce themselves to anybody, and walk into the building to see how long it would take them to be stopped by somebody in the building.

Every school that we contacted said they had policies in place; that no stranger was going to get through the front door without being confronted by the clerk at the front desk. Well, in some schools we had reporters wandering around for 40 minutes, including schools that were staffed by police officers.

So we reported that information to our local readers. They then had the information they needed to go to their school boards and say, hey, our kids are not safe. One of our reporters found himself alone with a young girl in the gymnasium, no teacher around. That's the kind of stuff that our local readers turn to us for.

The other important role that we fulfill is in our op. ed. pages, which, for those of us who live in Maine, it's kind of like going to the dump on Saturday morning and you share information, opinions, just kind of like, you know, the flavor of life. Our op. ed. pages, you

know, not the dump atmosphere, obviously, but it provides that forum for people to say, you know, if we report a story about state government or about the school security audit, our readers can write to us and express their opinion, and we create a dialogue on those pages that's not available in many, many other places.

You know, you watch the 6 o'clock news on television or you listen to, you know, the noon report on radio and you can speak back to that, but, you know, the family dog is the only person hearing you. In the newspaper, you write a letter, you write an op. ed., you're affecting a lot of people's opinion about how you feel, and it's our ability, I think, to make positive change, bring up things that are important to us as communities.

And if we look back over the history of journalism, you know, from the beginning of this country and look at newspapers, they provide a portrait of the political climate in this country. Social changes, what's important to people not just to politicians, but the real people who are building homes, trying to survive when they own a business, what's important to their schools, how educational change has been affected.

Those are things that it's important for local ownership to uphold, local readers to contribute to, and

local journalists to pay attention to, but otherwise we're too homogenous. You know, we don't get that flavor of the country.

It's kind of -- I don't really think newspapers are interactive in the interactive sense, but, in fact, they really are because you pick up the newspaper, you read the front page story, you go to the water cooler, and you're interacting with people that you're talking to. That's really essential because that local reporting, that local level reflects who we are as communities, and that's -- I don't know about everybody else here, but that's pretty important to me, and it should be important to all of us as human beings.

I'm short, but there you go.

(Audience applause.)

MR. ENSSLIN: Thank you, Ms. Meyer.

Ms. Pingree.

MS. PINGREE: Thank you very much. Thank you to the members of the Federal Communications Commission for being with us here today, and thank you for giving me this opportunity to share my thoughts with you.

I look at this issue from a variety of perspectives. Until earlier this year, I was the National President of Common Cause. Prior to that I served as a state legislator, and I've been a small

business owner.

In the past four years of working at Common Cause, I received a tremendous education on the policy, laws, and regulations regarding media ownership. As you know very well, during this time the issue of media ownership and reform went from the obscure domain of geeks, lawyers, activists and broadcast attorneys, to a subject of national debate and litigation, as well as Congressional action.

At Common Cause we saw our mailing lists and membership anger grow on this issue as much as anything else, and I know you'll hear from many of those activists today to talk about their concerns.

But I want talk to you a little bit about the first time I had to speak actually in front of a couple of you, and the examples I drew on from my time in Maine and not some of the statistics and policies that you're going to be hearing about from a variety of people today.

In 1992 I was a state legislative candidate in Knox and Waldo Counties. That's a district of about 19 towns an hour and a half up the road from where you're sitting. I was a total unknown from one of the smallest towns in the district running against a very well known opponent; but at that time the district was covered by